

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/989,591	11/20/2001	Matthew Walters	72180-88004		
7590 07/13/2004			EXAMINER		
Greensfelder, Hemker & Gale, P.C.			JOHNSON III, HENRY M		
Intellectual Property Group Suite 2000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
10 South Broadway St. Louis, MO 63102			3739 DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No	Applicant/s)				
Office Action Summary The MAILING DATE of this communication		Application		Applicant(s)	n^/			
		09/989,59		WALTERS, MATTHEW				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
			lohnson, III	3739				
Period fo		mon appears on the	: cover sneet with the	correspondence address				
THE - External enternal entern	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA assions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever cation. ays, a reply within the state ory period will apply and wi, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be t utory minimum of thirty (30) da ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro lication to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communicatio IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <i>19 Mav 2004</i> .						
•	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) <u>20</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,4,8-10,12,14-17 and 19</u> is/a Claim(s) <u>2,3,5-7,11,13 and 18</u> is/are of Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from co re rejected. Djected to.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)□ 10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objected Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th The oath or declaration is objected to b) accepted or b) on to the drawing(s) be e correction is requir	oe held in abeyance. S ed if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	cuments have been cuments have been the priority documents laureau (PCT Rul	n received. In received in Applica ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Inform	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT ser No(s)/Mail Date <u>030102</u> .		4) Interview Summal Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

This application lacks formal drawings. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is unclear as presented. It appears a word is missing.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the sandpaper" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the sandpaper" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the sandpaper" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,275,156 to Milligan et al. Milligan et al. disclose a reusable heat pack using a supercooled solution and a trigger means comprising spherical objects (particles) that may be glass or ceramic (Col. 4, line 1) in a receptacle (support). The particles are interpreted as being

Art Unit: 3739

partially dry due to there being in contact with one another and the support. The supercooled solution is sodium acetate tetrahydrate (Col. 3, line 25), although sodium acetate is disclosed in the background for U.S. Patent 4,077,390 (Col. 1, line 68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,275,156 to Milligan et al. Milligan et al. disclose heat packs using flexible materials such as plastic for the container but do not disclose expressly the composition of the plastic. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select a durable, economic material because Applicant has not disclosed that a specific material provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any flexible material that provided the strength and flexibility required for treatment because containment of the solution is the primary consideration. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the array configuration of Larsen to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,275,156 to Milligan et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,305,733 to Walters. Milligan et al. are discussed above, but do no teach fastening means. Walters discloses a heat pack with a fastener to hold the pack in place (Fig. 6, #70). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the fastener as taught by Walters in the invention of Milligan et al. to secure the heat pack to the area being treated.

Application/Control Number: 09/989,591 Page 4

Art Unit: 3739

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 is allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 13 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 4, 8, 9 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Henry M Johnson, Ill whose telephone number is (703) 305-0910. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Linda C Dvorak can be reached on (703) 308-0994. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Jøńnson, III

ént Exáminer

Art Unit 3739